

.

From: Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 11:51 AM
To: Salemi, Charles (DPH)
Cc: O'Brien, Elisabeth (DPH); Hanchett, James (DPH)
Subject: RE: New evidence

sorry, no I didn't meant to imply that someone (external) suggested that we are not in compliance. Just based on my reading of the guidelines - we need to have regularly reviewed written SOPs.

I don't have the State Police SOPs , although that would be a nice place to start but I was afraid they would ask for ours in return.

From: Salemi, Charles (DPH)
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 11:28 AM
To: Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
Cc: O'Brien, Elisabeth (DPH); Hanchett, James (DPH)
Subject: RE: New evidence

Julie , No problem with the changes. As far as SWGDRUG, I believe we are meeting their recommended METHODS guidelines. We definitely don't meet things like continuing education training, Space requirements, paperwork tracking, etc. Did someone suggest where we are not complying? Do you have a copy of the State Police methods for drug testing? CBS

From: Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 11:01 AM
To: O'Brien, Elisabeth (DPH); Salemi, Charles (DPH)
Subject: New evidence
Importance: High

Betsy/Chuck,

In an effort to minimize the number of analysts per case (and those that may have to potentially testify), we need to make some changes. We've discussed all of these before - some are relatively easy and some that may make sense but we can't implement right now.

- The first change, effective immediately is that for all NEW evidence we will keep the cases together i.e., not split them up by substance type.
- We (Carol Cormier and I) are consulting labor relations and possibly MOSES on the fairest way to assign analysts cases by geographic area. This one could take a few months.
- The most radical change would involve a single chemist taking the case start to finish. This has both positive and negative consequences. On the plus side, only one analyst would ever need to testify. However, we would need to do a lot of training; I suspect that we would loose efficiency and scheduling would be a challenge. All data would require a secondary review. While I support the idea, implementation seems beyond our capacity right now. Stay tuned.

I have had a request from the defense e attorneys association for the SOPs. I have not sent anything yet, but we will have to comply. FYI - we are not actually following all of the 2008 Scientific Working group guidelines. I know that you guys are too busy to spend a significant amount of time with this, so I will draft procedures using the SLI standard format but will NEED help with the content. I'll do the best I can extracting info from the training manual which you & some of the chemists can help edit.

meeting w/ the judiciary this afternoon. I'll keep you updated.
Julie

Julianne Nassif

Director, Division of Analytical Chemistry
William A Hinton State Laboratory Institute
Massachusetts Department of Public Health
305 South Street Boston, MA 01230
voice 617-983-6651 fax 617-983-6662
julianne.nassif@state.ma.us